Case 2:12-cv-00043-DLC Document 35-2 Filed 01/21/13 Page 1 of 5

to any other person, use them for any purpose, or store or copy them in any medium. Thank you for your cooperation.

From: Jon Robinson [mailto:jrobinson@brelaw.com] **Sent:** Thursday, December 27, 2012 12:42 PM

To: Bob Carlson

Cc: RichardRamler@aol.com

Subject: RE: Barber v Remington et al - Plaintiffs' First Request for Production

Bob:

This is to confirm receipt of your email below. Please send a complete draft of what you plan to file with the court regarding your requested extension, and allow Rick and I some time to review and approve it before filing. We will not be "unopposed" to your motion unless we have an opportunity to review and approve it before it is filed. Thanks,

Jon

Jon D. Robinson Bolen Robinson & Ellis, LLP 202 South Franklin, 2nd Floor, Decatur, IL 62523 217.429.4296 - fax 217.329.0034

From: Bob Carlson [mailto:BCarlson@cpklawmt.com]

Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2012 1:24 PM

To: Jon Robinson

Cc: RichardRamler@aol.com

Subject: Barber v Remington et al - Plaintiffs' First Request for Production

Jon:

This is a follow up to our telephone conversation this morning concerning Plaintiffs' First Request for Production. As we discussed, I was unable to get in touch with Rick and called you to advise you that the defendants were considering filing a Motion for Protective Order requesting the Court to stay discovery until after it decides the pending Motion to Dismiss. As we discussed the Montana local district court rules require counsel to discuss any discovery issues with opposing counsel (either by telephone or in person) prior to filing any discovery motions. This is to confirm that you suggested, as an alternative to the defendants filing a motion to stay, giving the defendants a 30 day extension to answer, object, or otherwise respond to the First Request for Production. As I advised you the defendants do have objections to the plaintiffs' requests for production. We both agreed that by this extension neither side was waiving any objections or positions it has concerning the Requests.

This is to confirm that, based on the above, the defendants accept your offer of an extension. I will file an unopposed motion with the Court for an extension up to and including February 20 to answer, object, or otherwise respond to the Requests.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns about any of the above.

Thank you for your courtesy.

Take care,

Bob

Robert M. Carlson

Corette Pohlman & Kebe 129 W. Park Street Suite 300 Butte, MT 59701 406-782-5800 Phone 406-723-8919 Fax bcarlson@cpklawmt.com

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and may also be privileged. If you are not the named recipient, or have otherwise received this communication in error, please delete it from your inbox and notify Corette Pohlman & Kebe at bcarlson@cpklawmt.com or call 406-782-5800. Please do not disclose its contents to any other person, use them for any purpose, or store or copy them in any medium. Thank you for your cooperation.

Case 2:12-cv-00043-DLC Document 35-2 Filed 01/21/13 Page 3 of 5

(406)388-6842 fax RichardRamler@aol.com www.ramlerlaw.com

This electronic mail message may constitute attorney-client communication that is privileged by law. The information contained in this e-mail is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure. It is being transmitted to you and is intended only for the use of the individual named. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby advised that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please do not forward or use this information in any way, and notify me immediately by telephone at (406)388-0150, fax at (406)388-6842, or e-mail at RichardRamler@aol.com, and destroy this message. Thank you.

----Original Message----

From: Jon Robinson <jrobinson@brelaw.com>
To: Bob Carlson <BCarlson@cpklawmt.com>

CC: "RichardRamler@aol.com" < RichardRamler@aol.com >

Subject: RE: Barber v Remington et al - Plaintiffs' First Request for

Production

Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2012 17:38:04 +0000

Bob, we have reviewed and approve your filing of the motion and submission of the order. Jon

Jon D. Robinson Bolen Robinson & Ellis, LLP 202 South Franklin, 2nd Floor, Decatur, IL 62523 217.429.4296 - fax 217.329.0034

From: Bob Carlson [mailto:BCarlson@cpklawmt.com]

Sent: Friday, December 28, 2012 10:08 AM

To: Jon Robinson

Cc: RichardRamler@aol.com

Subject: RE: Barber v Remington et al - Plaintiffs' First Request for Production

Jon:

I have attached the proposed Unopposed Motion for Extension with form Order. Please let me know if this is acceptable.

Thank you.

Bob

Robert M. Carlson

Corette Pohlman & Kebe 129 W. Park Street Suite 300 Butte, MT 59701 406-782-5800 Phone 406-723-8919 Fax bcarlson@cpklawmt.com

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and may also be privileged. If you are not the named recipient, or have otherwise received this communication in error, please delete it from your inbox and notify Corette Pohlman & Kebe at bcarlson@cpklawmt.com or call 406-782-5800. Please do not disclose its contents

Robert M. Carlson

Corette Pohlman & Kebe

129 W. Park Street

Suite 300

Butte, MT 59701

406-782-5800 Phone

406-723-8919 Fax

bcarlson@cpklawmt.com

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and may also be privileged. If you are not the named recipient, or have otherwise received this communication in error, please delete it from your inbox and notify Corette Pohlman & Kebe at bcarlson@cpklawmt.com or call 406-782-5800. Please do not disclose its contents to any other person, use them for any purpose, or store or copy them in any medium. Thank you for your cooperation.

From: RichardRamler@aol.com [mailto:RichardRamler@aol.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2013 11:16 AM **To:** Bob Carlson; dwills@smbtrials.com

Cc: jrobinson@brelaw.com **Subject:** Barber Discovery

Dale and Bob: As you know, the court denied your motion to extend the discovery deadline. We will not stipulate informally to extend the deadline for responding to our requests for production. Rick

Richard A. Ramler Ramler Law Office, P.C. 202 West Madison Ave. Belgrade, MT 59714 (406)388-0150 RichardRamler@aol.com

jrobinson@brelaw.com

Re: Barber Discovery

Thursday, January 03, 2013 3:24 PM

Bob Carlson; dwills@smbtrials.com

Bob Carlson

From:

Sent:

To:

Cc: Subject:

Bob: You can go ahead and file your motion to stay discovery. I am sorry if there was any misunderstanding. Rick
Richard A. Ramler
Ramler Law Office, P.C.
202 West Madison Ave.
Belgrade, MT 59714
(406)388-0150
(406)388-6842 fax
RichardRamler@aol.com
www.ramlerlaw.com
This electronic mail message may constitute attorney-client communication that is privileged by law. The information contained in this e-mail is privilleged, confidential and exempt from disclosure. It is being transmitted to you and is intended only for the use of the individual named. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby advised that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please do not forward or use this information in any way, and notify me immediately by telephone at (406)388-0150, fax at (406)388-6842, or e-mail at RichardRamler@aol.com, and destroy this message. Thank you.
In a message dated 1/3/2013 1:59:45 P.M. Mountain Standard Time, BCarlson@cpklawmt.com writes:
Rick:
Your email caught me by surprise.
roul chull caught the by suiphise.
As the attached email correspondence on December 27 and 28 with Jon reflects, it was Jon who suggested that
Plaintiffs give the Defendants an extension to answer, object or otherwise respond to the Plaintiffs' First
Requests for Production until February 20. This was in lieu of the Defendants filing a Motion for Protective
Order to Stay discovery pending a determination by the Court on the Motion to Dismiss. In my mind Jon's offer
·
and our acceptance of that offer created an informal stipulation for extension. Confirming it with the Court via
an unopposed and agreed to Motion was a mere formality. Included in the agreement with Jon was that both
sides were reserving any and all objections or positions we had with respect to the Requests.
Can you explain for me why the Plaintiffs have changed their mind and are backing out of an agreed extension?
can you explain for the wify the Haintins have changed their filling and are backing out of an agreed extension?
Thank you for your time and attention.
Bob
1